

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 22 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by a manual by Adobe (“Adobe”). The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being unpatentable over Adobe in view of U.S. Patent 5,982,924, issued to Power et al. (“Power”). The Examiner also rejected claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being unpatentable over Adobe.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 12-17 and 22. Applicants have added claims 25-34. However, Applicants have not canceled any claim. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 12-17, 22 and 25-34 will remain pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Claims 1-5 and 12-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by Adobe. The Examiner also rejected claims 5 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being unpatentable over Adobe. The Examiner also rejected claims 12-17 under 35 U.S.C §103 as being unpatentable over Adobe in view of Power.

Claims 5 and 12-17 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method of performing color correction on at least one image. The image includes several pixels. The method accepts a first vector input from a first color adjustment pad. The first vector input proportionally adjusts a color of pixels of a first selected luminance value in a color space of the image, where the color space includes at least one luminance component that defines the image. The method adjusts a color of pixels with other luminance values in the color space, in a manner related to a difference between the first selected luminance value and the other luminance value.

Applicants respectfully submit that Adobe does not disclose, teach, or suggest a such method. Adobe describes a method for adjusting brightness, midtones and contrast of an image. See Adobe, page 118. Adobe describes directly adjusting the color of pixels in the RGB color

space of an image. See Adobe figures, page 118; see also Adobe, page 109, right column. Adobe does not describe adjusting the color of pixels in a color space that includes a luminance component. For example, a color space that includes a luminance component can be a YUV or YCrCb color space. See e.g., specification, page 28, lines 18-22. One of many advantages of a color space that includes a luminance component is that it reduces processing cycles and saves time through the avoidance of rendering. See e.g., specification, page 28, lines 10-16.

The Examiner states that changing the contrast of an image, as described in pages 117 and 118 of Adobe, discloses the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Adobe only describes changing the pixels value of an image in either a RGB (Red, Green, and Blue) or CMYK (Cyan, Magenta, Yellow, and Black) color space. Therefore, whenever the contrast of an image is changed, the pixels values are changed in either the RGB or CMYK color space. The RGB and CMYK color spaces do not include a luminance component. In contrast, claim 1 recites adjusting a color of pixels of a first selected luminance value in a color space of the image, where the color space includes at least one luminance component that defines the image.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Adobe does not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-5 and 12-17 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 12-17 are patentable over Adobe for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejection of claims 1-5 and 12-17.

II. Claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C §102 as being anticipated by Adobe. Claim 22 recites a computer program product that includes a computer readable medium. The computer program includes instructions stored thereon which when

executed perform color correction on at least one image that includes several pixels. The instructions include sets of instructions for accepting a first vector input from a first color adjustment pad. The first vector input proportionally adjusts a color of pixels of a first selected luminance value in a color space of the image, where the color space includes at least one luminance component that defines the image. The instructions include sets of instructions for adjusting a color of pixels with other luminance values in the color space, in a manner related to a difference between the first selected luminance value and the other luminance value.

Applicants respectfully submit that Adobe does not disclose, teach, or suggest such a computer program product. Adobe describes a method for adjusting brightness, midtones and contrast of an image. *See* Adobe, page 118. Adobe describes directly adjusting the color of pixels in the RGB color space of an image. *See* Adobe figures, page 118; *see also* Adobe, page 109, right column. Adobe does not describe adjusting the color of pixels in a color space that includes a luminance component. For example, a color space that includes a luminance component can be a YUV or YCrCb color space. *See e.g.*, specification, page 28, lines 18-22. One of many advantages of a color space that includes a luminance component is that it reduces processing cycles and saves time through the avoidance of rendering. *See e.g.*, specification, page 28, lines 10-16.

The Examiner states that changing the contrast of an image, as described in pages 117 and 118 of Adobe, discloses the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Adobe only describes changing the pixels value of an image in either a RGB (Red, Green, Blue) or CMYK (Cyan, Magenta, Yellow, Black) color space. Therefore, whenever the contrast of an image is changed, the pixels values are changed in either the RGB or CMYK color space. The RGB and CMYK color spaces do not include a luminance component. In contrast, claim 22

recites adjusting a color of pixels of a first selected luminance value in a color space of the image, where the color space includes at least one luminance component that defines the image.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Adobe does not render claim 22 unpatentable. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 22.

III. New Claims 25-34

In this Amendment, Applicants have added new claims 25-34. Claims 25-34 recite similar limitations as claims 2-5 and 12-17, except that claims 25-34 are directed towards a computer program product. As claims 25-34 are dependent on claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25-34 are patentable over Adobe for at least the same reasons that were discussed above for claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25-34 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims, namely claims 1-5, 12-17, 22 and 25-34 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 4/10/06

Ali Makoui
Ali Makoui
Reg. No. 45,536

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 785-0140x302
Fax: (310) 785-9558